

## **Book 4**

**The Roman fairy tale of the barbarianism of the Germans**

**The forgery of TACITUS' *GERMANIA***

## Bridge

Historical source research finds itself in a severe crisis. The crisis is characterised by the symptom that experts can handle only *one* method in order to still save the "authenticity" of the medieval tradition: the explanation of all source mysteries by the bottomless stupidity of medieval document and chronicle scribes. The experts are unable to recognise the cause of this uncomfortable state of affairs, because they are, now as much as before, convinced of the "empiricism" of their method. They shout out: but our method rests firmly and securely on the evidence of eye-sight, on the material attributes of historical sources. This is indeed quite true, unfortunately however, before the postulation of their methods, the source researchers have, out of their belief in authority, neglected to examine whether there might be a possibility that the medieval history globe could have been turned, i.e. that the mass of the tradition as a whole could have been artificially modified. The following comparison may well serve to clarify the situation: in the realm of astronomy, the PTOLEMAIC system does not contain any contradiction (formally). All details of the system are (formally) coherent.<sup>1</sup> But how about the prerequisites of this system? Why, PTOLEMY too, started out with the "evidence of eye-sight", an "indubitable" certainty: the stationary Earth, and a fixed star sphere rotating as a whole! Our historians too, have a certainly very beautiful and artful system with a "stationary Earth", and this stationary globe is, for them, the "indubitable genuine basic stock" of the medieval tradition.

That the belief in authority amongst experts is still no empty illusion, is witnessed by an incident which took place around two decades ago, on the event of the publication of a newly discovered "version" of the *VITA BENNONIS* by TANGL. TANGL remarks in his preface: "To perhaps also doubt the authenticity of the new *VITA BENNONIS* because of the raised doubts would be an outrage [!!; insert by Kammeier] which I have to outright reject." ILGEN,

in understandable excitement, countered: "This then means nothing else but wanting to establish the belief in authority as a directive also for historical research. Hopefully, in our realm of science, it has not already gotten that far!"<sup>2</sup>

Now, it is not so much *the* belief in authority that the expert wants to instill in the disciple gently or with pressure, but the greatest doom lies in the monstrous force of *that* belief in authority which emanates from the sources of tradition themselves, and which turns the expert into a devout slave. BAKON has already postulated that the *doubt* is the father of truth. Up to this day, his words have not found any noticeable echo amongst the "critical" source researchers, because we remember the warning of a researcher, "to resist the spicy urge of critical scepticism as strongly (!) as possible". (Book 2, p 90)

In this final book, proof that the universal forgery action has also fabricated the German reports of ROMAN authors, shall complete the chain of evidence.

# 1.

## The originators of the forgery action

When in the first book, for the first time, the thought of a universal history falsification action was spoken out, our first question in the face of onstoming doubts and counter-arguments was: in the Middle Ages, was such an enterprise even *possible* at all? Our answer to that was already at this early stage: given that certain conditions were indeed met, then the possibility of a comprehensive planful falsification of the tradition must be conceded. Of what kind did these conditions have to be? We have already sketched them as follows:

A universal forgery enterprise in the Middle Ages is conceivable only under the condition that a widespread association of people exists, who all have an equally strong interest in the planned forgeries. In order to even seriously consider a universal, systematic falsification of the past at all, it is necessary that *a tightly organised society spread across the entire medieval Europe exists* already. A single individual, a small or even bigger association of like-minded people, will not seriously consider an enterprise which aims at a general, systematic falsification of historical factuality; the hopelessness of such a move is obvious from the start. However, the plan of a universal falsification action gains an entirely different appearance when it is born in the womb of a tightly organised society of world standing. If such an association of interested people, besides the sufficient number of members, is also in the possession of the necessary scientific and material means as well, the possibility of the success of such enormous plan is indeed given. We will have to concede that in the Middle Ages, a powerful, world-spanning organisation which had the right scientific tools was very well equipped to successfully launch a forgery action on the largest scale.

We now ask further: *in the Middle Ages, did such a widespread, influential and spiritually educated association exist?* Yes, **the medieval church was such a – or better, the only – organisation!**

If we view the *late medieval* church as one uniform entity, it appears to our eyes as a well-ordered organism of enormous dimensions. Of the two great partitions which form the body of the church, the clergy and the mass of laymen, the latter is eliminated from our observation; *we define the term 'church' in its narrow meaning of the community of the clergy.* To us, the church is the priest state, the firmly knitted association of the clergy of all lower and higher grades. In the late Middle Ages, members of this big, unique family were sitting in all nooks and crannies of the occidental civilised world. By equal education, equal occupation, equal language, equal outlook on life and equal life aspiration, the members of this clergy state felt most tightly connected. An organisation which could not be conceived any more tightly knit, linked the entirety to one highest will, to the pope in ROME. Every impulse of will flashing up in the head of this enormous organism, i.e. in the ROMAN curia, found a way into the body, and, if necessary, was turned into action in the most distant limbs.

The question: in the Middle Ages, was a universal falsification enterprise on the largest scale possible?, we can now answer thus: in a world-spanning, tight organisation, the way the late medieval church (clergy) represented it, there existed without doubt the *possibility* to seriously consider an extraordinary plan such as the general, systematic falsification of the medieval tradition, and to implement it with a chance of success. Naturally, this is not to say that such decision could have been seriously made by some random medieval cleric, or a loosely connected group of clerics within the church community, but the possibility of both the initial consideration as well as the feasibility of such gigantic enterprise lay solely with the church as a whole, lay with the highest management, i.e. with the curia in ROME. If in ROME, in the lap of the highest clerical

authority, the plan of a universal falsification enterprise was decided upon, then, without question, for the implementation of this plan, the most favourable outlook existed. Within the clergy, especially within the order clergy, an army of scientific workers was available, or could be educated, easily stocked up and increased for this special purpose. Under the ultimate supervision of a staff of learned clerics, the subordinate employees could perform all mechanical work. Since they were free from all inhibiting circumstances of a civil life, all employees were able to dedicate their entire powers to the allocated work. Strict clerical obedience, together with strict discipline, guaranteed the unconditional secrecy of the enterprise. *If* the overall church, under leadership of the highest authority, behind the walls of churches and monasteries, moved for the great forgery campaign, then the entire rest of the world was not in a position to understand or comprehend the secret ongoing at all. By the fact that science was in the sole possession of the clergy, the entire rest of the world was helpless in facing a potential history falsification; why, the layman was not even able to recognise *that* something unusual was going on behind the monastery walls.

Thus it has to be considered a done deal: *if* the late medieval church as such, i.e. the leadership of the overall church, decided on the plan of performing a systematic, general correction of history according to certain criteria, then, the way things were standing, the outlook of a good success of the enterprise was as favourable as it could have been. The *possibility* of a late medieval forgery campaign on the largest scale – that is, in the lap of the overall church – did exist without a doubt.

From the preliminary question whether in the late Middle Ages, in the lap of the overall church, a general, systematic history falsification – in the diplomatical as well as in the literary series – was possible – which was to be answered affirmative – I now come to the main question. This is: *has the church, under the initiative and leadership of ROME, indeed carried out such a universal forgery action?*

In terms of material liable to answer this question of all historical questions, what does historical research have to offer? We already know: what historical science has to say on the problem of universal forgery action, is less than little – namely nothing! Historical science does not know such a problem – more accurately: *it does not acknowledge such a problem!* It is "convinced" that such a problem cannot exist at all! Already during the past two centuries, historical science, as reported in Book 2, has been made aware of the problem at least twice – both times, the historians have not noticed that there, the main problem of the paper tradition stood before them warningly! Both times, the enormous problem has raised its head outside the realm of "science", before its gates, so to speak. Science rejects the question of universal history falsification action vehemently and as a matter of principle. Such a question is not considered "scientific". The fact that up to our day, historical research, working so diligently and thoroughly, could have carelessly bypassed that question, which in terms of urgency and consequence outranks every other historical problem skyhigh, will for all times form powerful proof for how endlessly difficult it is in historical things, too, to escape the almighty spell of prejudice, authority and habits.

Like hypnotised, historical research, again and again, turns its eyes only to the *single*, here and there occurring and ongoingly discovered *isolated* forgery cases. The at least small mass of the exposed forgeries appears to science as a bunch of random parts, different by nature, which have nothing to do with each other. Research sees itself equally standing before a pile of smithereens, which can be catalogued only by their attributes, their provenance and their age. Whether perhaps an entire vessel can be put together with those smithereens, is an idea that has not occurred to research. Whether perhaps all individual parts can be connected by a mental bond, *whether all individual and seemingly isolated forgery occurrences are parts of a big, uniform action*, such questions have remained unknown to historical science up to

this day. During the course of our examinations, we had to come to that conclusion often enough.

Yet, the question of the possibility and factuality of a systematic, universal forgery enterprise lay near the path, so to speak. One would have had to bump into it long ago, if not the by the highest management of the enterprise, in their very own interest, erected high walls of authority and prejudice had blocked out all views from the earliest days. *The forgers themselves played their own first critics, and they have wisely steered the by and by awakening critique onto a fixed track, and paralysed it.*

Already the following simple thought process could and should have lead the experts – in our case we mean the "critical" source researcher with the deep fear of any sharp scepticism – directly to the problem of a systematic history falsification on behalf of the church. A thought process which does not have to be strenuously sought for, but which forces itself.

The medieval church, this so artfully hierarchically organised clerical state, was comprised of a large number of big and small districts and provinces. Around all churches, monasteries, bishoprics, the ROMAN curia placed itself as the all-uniting, firmly gripping bond. *In the Middle Ages, ROME was not an area outside and next to the church, but ROME is the sum of all small and big districts and provinces.* The way all nerve fibre unites in the brain, the way the heart is the target for every single drop of blood, so was Rome the sending and receiving centre of the entire clerical life. Now, as we know, historical source critique has established, albeit in the erroneous presumption that they were "practical" cases, that *almost every monastery, almost every church* has committed document forgeries. Seeming exceptions only prove the rule and are a proof for the today "despite all refinement of the critical methods still existing "defencelessness" of diplomatics facing such deceptions, if they

have only been fabricated with some skill".<sup>3</sup> Critical research has furthermore established that *almost every bishopric* has cast fake documents, and often enough, entire series. *If it was thus an established fact for the experts that countless monasteries and churches have improved historical reality by comprehensive document forgeries, if, according to the judgement of a document researcher<sup>4</sup>, it is undeniable that "that even the most excellent men of the church, clerics whose piety and righteous way of life is highly praised, have taken refuge to forgery and fraud when it was the objective to increase or defend the possessions, the rights, the image of their churches", with other words: if all parts of the church have dealt in document forgery, should the head of the church body, which was of course tightly connected with these parts, should then the overall church as such, the ROMAN curia have refrained from historuy falsification!?*

If abbots, if bishops and archbishops, without scruples and as something somehow natural, have tidied the past, or patched up the holes of the tradition with their own ingredients, as something generally known and practised, *there the curia alone should have stood aside indifferently and inactively as a relaxed spectator?* Why, of what else was the civil servant body of the highest clerical administration comprised but *of just the servants of the church, for whom the practice of document forgery has become a matter of flesh and blood?* It is unintelligible how the experts can seriously believe that men, who up to then were born with document forgery as "characteristic expression" of their "naive and strongly sensitive" way of thinking and fighting, would have completely dropped their previous characteristic habits when entering the management of the church! Such a change, such immunity of Rome, in the centre of an infested world, would be more than a miracle. A quite extraordinary, pure and moral atmosphere would have had to rule in ROME, in order to turn human beings from children of their "naive and strongly sensitive era" into saints who loathed the deplorable, nonetheless generally ongoing document forgeries. Surely, of such

moral exception status of ROME in the Middle Ages, even the experts should have no knowledge. Quite the contrary, for the late Middle Ages, a LUTHER bonmot should be sufficiently characterising: the closer to ROME, the worse the Christians!

If, according to H BRESSLAU, the highest life aspiration of the majority of clerics was "to uplift, to enrich, to increase the power and the honour for *the church* amidst the general church to which they were initially associated", and if they did not hesitate a moment to resort to diplomatical falsification for achieving their purpose, it is not comprehensible why that circle of men to whom the well-being and image of the *overall church*, the church per se, was a heart's affair, would *not also* have employed such cheap and success-guaranteeing means, such as the setting straight of the tradition was. The fact that abbots for their monastery, bishops for their bishoprics, have committed forgeries, should have *necessarily* forced our experts to the conclusion, that the curia as well, in the interest of the great entirety, the overall church, would not likely have bypassed the machinations known and practised in all of the world. *Should there not have been good cause for the overall church to adjust the course of history?* Should there not have been good cause for the curia to subject the historical tradition to a critical revision in the interest of the overall church, and to reconstruct, if required, certain parts of history according to a newly postulated blueprint?

These so obvious lines of thought should have necessarily lead the experts to the main problem of the universal forgery enterprise, had not their spirit been paralysed by the century-long suggestion of the "indubitable" authenticity of the main mass of the tradition. Why, we have – in Book 3 – experienced the show, how gilded research has not been able to recognise the place of birth with even the forgeries that had their provenance from the ROMAN forgery headquarters written on their forehead.

Albeit starting with a *wrong* premise (namely that the medieval forgeries are isolated, "practical" occurrences from the varying centuries), in following the above lines of thought, diplomatical research would have found the true state of affairs (that all exposed forgeries are the result of the great action lead by ROME).

Now, for the accurate recognition of the nature of the Roman action, it is indispensable to highlight the following points:

1. When it had to be established time and again: all diplomatical and literary forgeries originate from *one* source, namely the ROMAN headquarters, the term 'headquarters' is not to be taken in the sense as if all falsifications had been fabricated in *one* geographic location, namely the curia in ROME. Much rather, the terms 'headquarters' and 'joint provenance' mean that *one highest resort*, the curia, represented the leadership of the movement. Forgery workshops, on the other hand, in which the plans of the uppermost leadership were implemented, were numerous; besides ROME and the rest of Italy, also in Germany, France and other European countries.

2. One could raise the question whether the forgery action is the work of a certain faction within the church, perhaps of *one* order? By the gained examination results, my readers have already been put in a position to answer that question for themselves, namely in the negative sense. One has to merely remember the fact which cannot be shaken: the forgery of the papal registries. It has been established that only the curia itself could have forged their registries. They would not have accepted forged registries against their will, much less have guarded them so carefully in their archives the way they did. From the fact that the papal registries represent the axis of the entire pseudo-tradition of the European Middle Ages, it necessarily follows that just the curia and no other place else formed the uppermost leadership of the action, and exercised it. Naturally now, not only civil servants of the curia

were at work as forgers, but the pool of forgers was recruited from all circles of the clergy, especially however, from the individual monks' orders. Submissive laymen, too, have been won over and employed by management, whereas these "humanist amateurs" are distinguished from the clerics only by their appearance, not wearing clergy attire.

3. The great history falsification has always been presented by me as a *learned* action. I believe no reader will have taken this in the way that this re-casting of medieval history is a learned sport. Viewed overall, the enterprise is much rather a deed based upon monstrously practical motives. Within the framework and with the means of the learned action, the curia has raised claims, and "historically founded" those, which possess the heaviest weight in "practical" significance. Is there even a higher claim at all than the one which the curia wanted to present to the world as "historically grown" in the *PSEUDO-ISIDORIAN DECRETALS*: "The pope is no longer a subject of the King, he is not only the head of the church, but the head of the entire world." (see Book 3, p 215) If such claims of the curia have been, by means of the late medieval learned action, presented as historically justified, then this learned and "ideal" action was guided by motives that one could not conceive any more "materialistic". And if history has been re-cast so that e.g. in Imperial coronations, the pope features as the giving party, then with this turn, the *per se* learned action did pursue a very materialistic purpose. Equally with the greatest humiliation in the German Emperors' history: the cooked up CANOSSA march of HENRY IV., which is being explained in the 5th chapter of this Book.

Primarily, the church, via the curia, has forged for itself as an *overall organism*, with invented facts which were to jointly benefit the head and all limbs (monasteries, churches, bishoprics). In second and third line then, the desires of the limbs (institutions of the church) were shown some consideration. The following point needs to be particularly stressed in order to prevent a misunderstanding. It is about the *significance* of the great mass of the forged documents for the *churches, monasteries* etc. Of these falsifications, too, it has always

been maintained that they represent learned fiction, not "practical" machinations. This however, is to be understood in a way, that these falsifications are also the result of the late medieval enterprise, and that indeed the very largest part of the *early* medieval documents for the churches and monasteries has only been produced to serve equally as the necessary folio for the general claims of the overall church, but on the other hand, merely as indifferent "history" papers for all sorts of cooked up personalities (e.g. invented series of bishops and abbots). Another small fraction of the fake pieces *however, has now again pursued very materialistic purposes for the specific monastery etc.* This goes especially for such fake pieces that have been temporally placed in the *last* centuries of the Middle Ages! *In that case, the per se "learned" forgery transformed itself into a surreptitious obtention of the most "practical" kind.*

## 2.

### **The legal history as witness of the forgery action**

The critical checking-through of the written tradition of the Middle Ages has produced conspicuous attributes in the diplomatical as well as in the literary tradition series, all of which allow for only one interpretation: the medieval tradition the way it exists today is of artificial making. Especially the rational interpretation of the itself revealing psychology of the alleged authors in the diplomatical as well as the literary series has delivered striking proof, that the reality of the historical tradition is an artificially modified one, one of paper. The following observation shall deliver further proof for the re-casting of the history of the Middle Ages, which extends to medieval *legal life* and *law formation*.

F KERN has, in the HISTORISCHE ZEITSCHRIFT<sup>5</sup>, given a gripping account of the medieval idea of law the way *he* has extracted it from the tradition. A comparison of modern and medieval law shows the principle opposite in the perception of the nature and provenance of the law in old and new times. In modern life, the law, in order to be valid, "needs one single attribute only: the direct or indirect implementation by the state", says Kern. "For the validity of the objective law, age means exactly nothing under the rule of the *nowadays* legal rights. In the Middle Ages, this was different: especially for the objective law, *age* was considered the most important attribute. The immemorial provenance, proven by the memory of the oldest and most trustworthy people, the 'leges patrum', potentially but not necessarily, is also attested by external memory aids such as documents, landmarks, law books, or other things surviving the lifetime of generations: that is the objective law." KERN then goes on to explain that, according to medieval presumption, not the state, but god was the originator and the beginning of all law. "The law is equal to the good per se", it has thus, albeit often obscured, been in the world as a piece of the divine world order from the beginning. Therefore, the "good old" law does not require to be explicitly "set" by any power, because it had been equally entrenched in the human conscience from the beginning. By investigation in the conscience of the people [Ger.: Volk], by appealing to the sense of justice of the people's community, the law can be "found" at any time and for any case. *It is therefore actually unnecessary to write down the law*, written accounts are at best of some use as external memory support, but only if it is about "old" law books and knowledge.

KERN summarises the medieval perception of the objective law in the following sentence: "The good old law is unset and unwritten."

There is now a question emerging. What KERN is airing here as alleged medieval idea of law, does it apply to the *entire* period that one is used to call the Middle Ages? Anyone who is somewhat knowledgeable in legal history knows that the above description is by no

means applicable to *all* medieval centuries. They remember the numerous legal records of the *earlier* medieval centuries, the written down people's law or tribal law of the SALIAN and RIPUARIAN FRANCS, the WESTERN GOTHS and EASTERN GOTHS, the BURGUNDY law book, the written down LANGOBARDIAN laws, the law of the ALLAMANS, FRISIANS etc.

Furthermore, the FRANCONIAN Imperial legislation (capitularies) was applied not on the ground of the people's law, but the King's law, which ultimately collides with the idea that "the law is unset and unwritten", "because the King decreed his Imperial laws one-sidedly or under council of his greats (i.e. without participation of the "people"), and the way they [the laws] came about, they could also be altered or cancelled again."<sup>6</sup> Thus, much in contradiction to KERN's thesis, quite the "modern" perception of law is showing up in the King's laws as much as in the people's law of this early era: in order to be valid, the law requires the implementation by a competent resort (King, "wise men", tribal council). Crucial is the momentum of the "statute" of the law, the public announcement: these statements shall from now on contain the valid law. A modern perception of law reveals itself also by the fact that decreed laws could be extended and developed at any time. Examples are the BURGUNDY legislation and the development of the law book of the WESTERN GOTHS.

So far, I have treated the early medieval law books *as if* they are historically authentic. Naturally, the authenticity stands in no doubt for the legal historical research. What human could have had an interest in forging entire law books?! The course of our investigation has lead us to a standpoint from which the entire legal history of the Middle Ages can be viewed and examined from an entirely new angle. If the term 'universal history falsification action' is to mean anything, then naturally, not only documents and historical works in their narrow sense, but also the entire medieval legal literature, the people's laws, the Imperial laws, synod and council decrees must then have taken their way through the forgery headquarters, i.e. they must be falsified. And indeed, with all people's laws, the

known characteristic attributes of the provenance from the great forgery workshop can be found at first glance. For this, I begin by pointing out some characteristic peculiarities of the law of the SALIAN FRANCS.

I. A "prologue and several barely more recent epilogues from around the middle of the 6th century"<sup>7</sup> accompanying the law inform us on how and by whom the statute and recording of the **SALIAN people's law (*LEX SALICA*)** are alleged to have occurred. Very conspicuous is now the fact that prologue and epilogue do not conform in their statements. "The prologue traces the *LEX SALICA* back to knowledge, which still in pagan times, was brought to the THING assembly by a delegation of four men in three different THING places. Later, a revision and expansion by CHLODOVECH was supposed to have occurred after he had converted to Christianity, and after that, by CHILDEBERT and CHLOTAR. The one *epilogue* however, denotes the 'primus rex Francorum', i.e. CHLODOVECH, as the *immediate originator* of the law. With regards to the later *expanding legislation of CHLODOVECH* and his sons CHILDEBERT and CHLOTAR, the epilogues quite conform to the details of the prologue."<sup>8</sup> That is a crass contradiction! *The one "barely more recent" epilogue reports something completely different on the recording of the SALIAN law than the prologue!* According to the very accurate details of the prologue, still in pagan times, *four* men in *three* different THING places announced the law, which then later has only been expanded by King CHLODOVECH; according to the epilogue however, not only the later expansion, but also the immediate authorship, the first statute of the law, is being attributed to the King CHLODOVECH. We know exactly the forgery trick used here: double-entry book-keeping! Deliberate veiling! We grow even more alarmed when we are told that the *LEX SALICA* is preserved *in several deviating versions*, which by the way does not match the thesis either, "that the people's law, by its nature, bore a permanent character".<sup>9</sup> The allegedly oldest version shows an order of the entire law in 65 titles. And now, with regards to the other scripts, comes an explanation

not at all surprising to us when we hear experts report that these "versions" show additions and alterations, even different title orders (99 and 70 titles!). Of course, we already know sufficiently that such different "versions" have been cast by the forgery guild especially for the purpose of introducing contradictions. What much rather surprises us, is the effort of expert critique in making the fact of the different versions somewhat explainable. SCHRÖDER reckons: "The numerous additions and alterations of later scripts, the new title orders with 99 and 70 titles and the attempts at language cleansing of the so-called 'lex emendata' go merely on the account of the copyists." (!)<sup>10</sup>

The things those "copyists" can do! They had no respect even for the old honourable laws. Why shouldn't they change and improve a little? But enough of those "copyists"; we already know these famous people too well to not know that they carried out their work in one of the late medieval forgery workshops. Namely, what we had to hear about the *LEX SALICA* up to now, is fully sufficient to pass judgement: the *LEX* in the today existing "versions" is not the old, authentic law book, but a fruit of the forgery action. We are supported in our conviction by the enormous struggle of the opinions which rages amongst the experts, especially over the SALIAN law, with violent anger. So many researchers, so many methods, so many results of uncertainty. (see Book 1, chapter 1) From the excited choir, we want to record one voice only, namely the opinion of B KRUSCH. He tells his opponents in abundant clarity: "Codex 1 (of the *LEX SALICA*) stems from the oldest and best model source, which has later been bungled by a stupid (!! ) interpolator, and the art of the editor consists of just eliminating that ugly dross... Only the more recent editors have, due to their lack of criticism (!), carefully reinstated the garbage into the text."<sup>11</sup>

II. We also hear noteworthy things about the **FRANCONIAN King's laws** (the capitularies). "The capitularies have been regularly issued in several copies. One went into the Royal archive. Special issues went to the Royal civil servants." Thus it was taken care of

several issues being in stock. Now however, the researchers have to report something to us, over which we outright lose our countenance. One is to pay attention: "Since the issues stored in the archives were not easy to keep in order (!!), and also, in part (!), were likely lost, the court, already under LUDWIG THE PIOUS, found itself pressed to quote a private collection (!! in cases of referrals to the older capitularies. The abbot ANSEGIS arranged for such a thing [private collection]... Despite being a private work (!), it achieved the reputation of an official collection within a short timespan."<sup>12</sup> Under LUDWIG already, all older capitularies, despite the many copies, have disappeared without a trace, but, thank god, a private man has scribbled together a little book of capitularies for himself, and has thus saved important laws for his co-world! His private work has then also been joyously acknowledged as an "official" collection of laws by the [Royal] court!

**III. The people's law of the Frisians** severely puzzles research. About the alleged formation of this law book, we find out that a deputation of FRISIANS versed in law has made statements on the law of the CENTRAL, EASTERN and WESTERN FRISIANS at the court of CHARLES THE GREAT. In this, one has to realise that those statements do not perhaps slumber in the archive as a historical novelty, but that they were to represent valid law of the FRISIANS. "The statements were made in the FRISIAN language, but were of course protocolled in Latin. This protocol is the *LEX FRISIONUM* handed down to us... thus, the complete absence of FRISIAN legal terminology, and the use of FRANCONIAN legal terms is explained. The chaotic content of the *LEX*, the multitude of contradictions (!) in it are explained by the majority of the legally versed, whose statements differed depending on their provenance and the nature of their knowledge... With this assumption, too, some details are difficult to explain (!), namely the decree entirely based on Pagandom, that the temple violator (!! should be sacrificed to the gods (!! whose temple he had violated. One can hardly imagine that this statement could have been protocolled without protest by a christian

scribe at the court of CHARLES THE GREAT."<sup>13</sup> Such monstrosity, one can imagine not hardly, but not at all! Such thing was supposedly declared valid FRISIAN law in CHARLES' name!! Surely, everybody senses the late medieval legal fablery<sup>1</sup> here – only a historian in law, as a devout slave of the written tradition, still stands faithful before such "genuine" legal source. Of course, other researchers explain the tricky thing differently; namely, they again see in the FRISIAN *LEX* a "private work".

IV. The hypothesis: the good old law is unset and unwritten, does *not* apply to the earlier centuries of the Middle Ages; much rather, during the times of the CAROLINGIANS, a quite modern perception of the nature of law was prevalent. However, if we now take a few steps ahead in the legal history, beyond the CAROLINGIAN era, *then all of a sudden, we stand before a total revolution of the entire state of legal affairs.* It appears to us that over night, *all* law books have been taken out of this world by ghosts' hands. In one blow, in the North and the South, in the East and the West, the idolatrously honoured "good old" law has become invisible! Uncanningly rapidly, the law had become, ravished by a mysterious illness, weak of old age, and it passed away. Truly, a most peculiar event! Let us hear what SCHRÖDER has to tell about this: "During the 10th century, the capitularies and people's law still maintained a certain standing, in the 11th century however, they have utterly sunk into oblivion. The Middle Ages had only an uncertain memory of the principal legislative activity of CHARLES THE GREAT, to whom public opinion traced back all secular law. An explicit cancellation of the old legal sources has never taken place, they got out of practice by themselves, because the circumstances of the state and the guilds as well as the economic life conditions had changed... *From the 10th to the 12th century, legislation has rested almost entirely*, the times weren't suitable for it (sic!), and the new formation of all legal relations was still too much in

---

I just made that word up as a derivative of the noun 'fable' – sue me.

motion for any legal determination to be possible. It was the time of the sole rule of the common law, whose actual bearers were and remained the tribes up to the 13th century."<sup>14</sup>

Let us have a closer look at SCHRÖDER's statements, which, by the way, represent the predominant view of legal historians. In essence, they read: from **the 10th to the 12th century, legislation has rested almost entirely**. Why? "The new formation of all legal relations was still too much in motion for any legal determination to be possible." In order to recognise the indefensibility of this measly explanation attempt, one consideration will suffice. Admittedly, the old legal *books* could have disappeared, but the *law* itself could not, or, more correctly: some law must have existed in those allegedly law-book-less centuries, too, must have been officially "cherished and fostered". FRENSDORFF<sup>15</sup> says: "The law, during these to us mute centuries, could not have stood still, the needs of the time must have gained influence upon and developed it." Now, SCHRÖDER himself denotes this book-less law *common law*<sup>II</sup>. The habits are based upon custom, they presume, *for a certain period of time, repeated action of equal nature*. So, common law is a law which does not change in the fashion of a kaleidoscope, but *remains identical over a longer time period*. The allegedly book-less medieval common law, in its *basic structure*, *must* have been the very same over decades, over at least one generation, it must have had a certain durability in its foundations, else a cherishing and fostering of the law was simply impossible. It goes without saying that, during the "mute" centuries, common law can not have stood still, it must have developed according to changing circumstances. It is impossible however, that the "new formation of all legal relations" could have been "so much in motion" centuries long, that a "legal determination" was impossible, because that would mean that the law in this entire era would have been so volatile and unsteady, that it would have renewed itself about every ten years *from the ground up*. No human being will find such wild general metamorphosis of the legal

---

II The German term is 'Gewohnheitsrecht' = lit. 'law of habits'

relations and thus, the law, credible – except the legal historians. Ultimately, common law has the tendency to longevity, it is laboriously concerned with retaining the status quo, and will only hesitatingly get itself to making concessions to changing circumstances.

As a result of our observation, we find: after the disappearance of the law books, the prevalent common law could not have been, centuries long, so volatile and confused, that a capture, a statute of the law would have been impossible. So, the problem comes thus to a point: *how come, that the competent official resorts, over the period of several centuries, equally let the law grow wild, and left the legislation to nature and chance?* How come that the competent secular rulers were so utterly uninterested in the law, that they even considered it unnecessary and superfluous to fix the prevalent law in writing? Just how did things get to a state, that the civilised Occident, in the 10th century, with regards to the most important relations of humans – legal life, could have sunk to the development stage of savage peoples? The law history researchers counter: why rack one's brains over it? The findings of the tradition testify that legal relations of those centuries were in state as described above – as difficult as it may be for reason, it has to bow down to the "facts of history", and faithfully accept what the tradition proclaims. Down with reason, long live the paper tradition!

Before revealing the solution to the great mystery, I want to point to some wondrous flowers that the wild growth, which one allegedly accepted as common law in the "mute" centuries, has produced.

How sad the state of affairs on the knowledge of the medieval Imperial laws is, has already been mentioned previously (Book 3). Electors' college, and, in connection with it, high offices, Royal election law per se, have always been a true crux for historians. It is exceedingly characteristic, that one has presented the Electors' college, and also the Lord High Chancellor's office of TRIER, as "*literary deeds*" of private medieval authors, i.e.

declared them theoretical creations. Lord High Chancellor's office of TRIER is regarded as a "literary deed" of MARTIN OF TROPPAU, the Electors' college as a "literary deed" of EIKE OF REPGAU – author of the well-known law book *DER SACHSENSPIEGEL [THE SAXON MIRROR]*, 'mirror' a little bit like in the *DAILY MIRROR*]. The fight of the legal historians, whether an EIKE or a MARTIN could have plucked their theory out of thin air, or whether both, in their literary creations, have merely expressed the factual power relations, is missing the main problem, which is, *that it was left to chance or the initiative of individual men to postulate a fixed rule for the King's election by a literary deed.* **Private persons acted as legislators**, and all official resorts were applauding and shouting in amazement: look at these wise men! That simpletons like us didn't have that idea ourselves! Although it is actually officially our duty!

We now want to take our eyes off the details, and direct them again to the overall complex of the "unset and unwritten" law of the "mute" centuries. We ask again: just how could it only get to a state, that in that era, during which those allegedly grown legally unruly people performed miracle works with the sky-scraping cathedrals, law statute and written law could have disappeared from this world? Answering this question is no longer difficult for us. *During the course of the forgery action, it was inevitable that besides the secular registries, the secular legislation, too, the way it of course existed fixed in writing also for the mute centuries, had to be erased.* The universal enterprise had to do a *proper* job, or their new historical construction would collapse. To falsify and reforge the entire diplomatical and literary tradition, and in this, leave the important realm of medieval legal life untouched, is not on. Of course, we have already been able to well observe the activity of the forgers when discussing the early medieval peoples' law (*LEX SALICA, LEX FRISIONUM*). At this point, I explicitly stress: these law books (like the "law mirrors" of later times as well) have by no means been invented front to end. There is much genuine, real law in them. However, according to the lyingly invented cultural low point of the Germans, the general level of legal

life had to hover around a certain lowness, and therefore, oodles of plain invented decrees had to "testify" to this low point (such as, e.g., the law on temple violators with the FRISIANS).

Why however, did the forgers not endeavour to fabricate laws for this now mute era, too? Two reasons were crucial for keeping one's hand off such work. Firstly: such endeavouurer proved to be impracticable. Invented law had to become, much more still, a traitor to the artificial nature of the medieval tradition than, for example, the forged papal registries already are. Law is simply an organism which grows, which equally disposes of old parts, and incorporates new ones. Cooking up a for centuries growing and changing law is no small order. This law could of course not be allowed to levitate in mid-air, but would have to be in ongoing mutual relations with the governmental, economic and societal life. The forgers were wise and cautious enough to sparingly employ their art, especially in the realm of law. E.g., there was one particular sore spot. Assuming one would fabricate further law books: *for the mute centuries, to which resort would one falsely allocate the authority to "set" the law?* One could not present the law as dropped from the sky. Two paths were available. One could have had the relevant law announced and set by either a congregation (of the people, legally versed men as representatives), or by an act of will by the ruler (King, Emperor). But which path to go now? People's law? Official law? Should one nicely take turns? We will have a look back at the *LEX SALICA*, and with this product, we notice already, how the forgers were cautiously attempting to avoid unique information, and to rather keep both paths open. This double-entry book-keeping has of course been quite carelessly employed in the *SACHSENSPIEGEL* as well. Namely, in chapter 55 of the first book of the *SACHSENSPIEGEL*, it says about the origin of judicial power: all law is **people's** law, and is determined by public vote. In the third book however, we find out something entirely different, namely: all law is **official** law, and originates with the King.

But there is still another reason why the forgery management, particularly for the mute centuries, omitted fabricating *secular* law books. Namely, for this period, the curia wanted to introduce the papal law to the European market! *Just at the time when the secular law disappeared during the mute centuries, the papal law books entered the scene of the tradition.* Just in the mute centuries, the law of the curia spreads (in the paper tradition). Since the end of the 9th century, the collections of canonical legal sources (such as that of abbot REGINO TO PRÜM, of bishop BURKHARD TO WORMS, of IWO OF CHARTRES) appear in the pseudo-tradition. And around 1230, under GREGORY IX., the first official papal collection of decretals is issued as christian-Germanic law. So, in the mute centuries, too, a written law existed – only not a secular one.

Just at this point in time, the written *secular* law raises from its long [temporally] death bed, and first in the form of the *SACHSENSPIEGEL*. How did it happen that German law was now written down again all of a sudden? Why has EIKE OF REPGAU (REPGOW) written his *SACHSENSPIEGEL*? Allegedly between 1215 and 1235, a learned, already aged knight, EIKE OF REPGAU of the province SERIMUNT (between ELBE, MULDE and SAALE) sits down at the desk in order to carry out an actually outrageous plan, namely to fix in writing the under his people, the SAXONS, prevalent wild common law for the first time. EIKE is alleged to have first composed his law book, which he later gave the title *MIRROR OF THE SAXONS*, in Latin, and later, on the request of a Count HOYER OF FALKENSTEIN, translated it into German. Now, which purpose did EIKE pursue with his *SACHSENSPIEGEL*? How did the thought occur to him at all, to fix the law of the SAXONS in writing? One rhymed preface and two prose prefaces inform on this:

"The author" (of the *SACHSENSPIEGEL*), says FRENSDORFF<sup>16</sup>, "from his occupation in the courts, had gotten to know the *state of the law* and the *views* of those who had to do with the law. They convinced him of the *necessity of a reform*; the only way to achieve it, he saw

in the written fixation not of a new law, thought up by him, but of the existing law... Because the law is old, only committed to memory, *threatening to vanish*, the book wants to come to the aid of those occupied with law application... The book is meant to merely ease their work, to save effort and cost, which presumably would have been caused by *procuring external legal advice*... The plan of the mirrorist upset some who had *done wrong and tried to pass it off as right*... An event in the county of OLDENBURG from 1336 shows, for how long the same desire on the one side, and the same resistance on the other, lasted on. Since the old knighthood of the country had died out, and *the young knighthood had proven to be uninformed on the law and insecure in its application*, Count JOHN ordered a script of the *SACHSENSPIEGEL* produced and made available."

The question: why has EIKE written his law book? is thus given an answer by the author himself, short and sweet as follows: because the younger generation had grown uninformed on the old law, because it threatened to vanish from memory. Because the law is applied precariously, and even wrong is passed off as right, that is why EIKE wants to rescue and secure the genuine, good law by fixing it in writing! Now, it is only a small step from this answer to answering the earlier question: is it at all possible that legal life of a civilised people can play out within the wild framework of common law *across three centuries (!)?* The question of the possibility of a centuries lasting low point of legal life in the medieval occident is to be unconditionally answered in the negative, because all the described improprieties, which caused EIKE OF REPGAU to compose his "written" law, **would have had manifested themselves on such scope and with such vigour already one hundred years after the disappearance of the people's law, that utter chaos would have taken over legal life, and an orderly jurisdiction would have been inconceivable.** Not only in the 13th century, but as early as in the 10th, the "old" law, only committed to memory, had to threaten to vanish, and in the 11th century, knowledge of the "old" law must have paled so,

the law must have been so disfigured and splintered in good as well as in evil intentions, in short, the legal insecurity must have so rapidly taken over, that not only the lukewarm "official" resorts, but all the world, from deepest misery, would have screamed out for a reform of the law. Unwritten law is no law, remains no law, because it destroys itself, and is utterly turned into injustice by arbitrariness and abuse. Law and memory get along as much as fire and water do. What is to become of jurisdiction, if of 20 jurors, one group would remember the old law differently to another group? Especially with old people, memory leaves to desire! And if all 20 remember the law differently, partly *want* to remember, who then is in possession of the "real" law? Why, according to Str. VIII of one of the prefaces of the *SACHSENSPIEGEL*, one group in opposition to the author remembers "the old law differently to him, and suggests changes to him".<sup>17</sup> The medieval legal history thus testifies two things: 1. *The legal sources* (like the secular registries) *have in part been completely destroyed*; 2. *If the sources are preserved, they have been falsified according to certain criteria.*

### 3.

#### **The falsification of TACITUS' *GERMANIA***

If, in this chapter, we turn towards *German primeval and early history*, it is of course because of the big question: is it possible to obtain proof that our oldest history has been dragged into the enormous re-casting process of the late medieval forgery action as well? As always, we answer this burning question by checking the *sources* of the German early history (and the psychology of their alleged authors) under the critical magnifier. Our sources on Germanic

history have been (mainly) written by ROMAN authors, i.e. in the following, we have to concern ourselves with ROMAN sources.

Besides **CAESAR** (*Commentarii de bello Gallico IV and VI*), *TACITUS'* *GERMANIA* is *the basis of all knowledge of the pre-history of the German people*. How about the authenticity of these sources? Or, more clearly: *have these ROMAN historical sources come upon us untouched, unfalsified?* Is the *GERMANIA*, *the way the work exists today*, the unscathed writing of the ROMAN author **TACITUS**? I answer this question with 'no'! I claim: the *GERMANIA* as well as CAESAR's excursus', the way their texts exist for us today, have been systematically falsified by the forgery association, in order to attribute to our ancestors the state of life of a culture-less people of barbarians.

A major suspicion against the unscathedness of the *GERMANIA* (which has however not yet been sensed by our gilded historians at all) finds its reason in the fact that it has been *preserved* in the first place, that it hasn't vanished off the face of the Earth without a trace! That sounds absurd, but only for as long as one has not steered their attention to the following noteworthy fact. Namely, two more famous Romans have written about country and folks in Germany, and these are *PLINIUS THE ELDER* and *LIVIUS*. LIVIUS, in the departments 104 and 137-139 of his work, has dealt in detail with the habits of the Germans, PLINIUS has equally dedicated a separate work to the German wars – but, and now comes the surprise: *the mentioned departments of the work of LIVIUS and the work on Germans by PLINIUS have disappeared without a trace!* A magic hand has swiped across these ROMAN sources, and they have fallen into eternal darkness! Coincidence, the experts shout at me. Oh yes, "chance" has been at work very planfully again. Wherever "chance" noticed anything Germanic in the ROMAN sources, he understood, and wiped those important sources out – thoroughly, traceless – he gnawed away their stock down to the last word. And yet, TACITUS' *GERMANIA* has been preserved for us! And CAESAR's excursus' are preserved as well. Indeed, but just

because the *GERMANIA* is preserved, for that and no other reason, chance (i.e.: the forgery association) had to let the works of PLINIUS and LIVIUS disappear! Because if the genuine sources of Plinius and Livius were preserved for us, it would be possible to feel with a stick that the *GERMANIA*, the way it exists, is no longer the unscathed work of TACITUS, but a bastard trimmed by the forgers. The vanishing act of the sources of PLINIUS and LIVIUS was inevitable in order to not reveal the culture-less waffle of the forged *GERMANIA* for what it is, namely phantasy descriptions of the late medieval forgers' guild. Without being clairvoyant, I can yet proclaim: the *genuine* sources of PLINIUS and LIVIUS will never again emerge.

However, *if* such sources yet turn up, they will be forged! And without having seen them, and without having thrown a glance at the "new" discoveries, I know today already what they will look like: *they will resemble the *GERMANIA* and *CAESAR*'s excursus' as one egg does the other!* LIVIUS will then be a twin of TACITUS, and PLINIUS an extended CAESAR. Both newly discovered ROMANS will *not* bring any new information, but serve anew the well-known "culture-less" dish from the *GERMANIA* in a slightly altered (formally) mixture.

Primarily, we now want to have a closer look at the *GERMANIA*. To the experts, be they historians or philologists, this ROMAN work of "genius" offers a daily growing mountain of riddles, contradictions and nonsense, so that they stand before this "wonderful" and "unique" source with head-shaking and hand-wringing. Today, one simply does not know any longer what to do with this "classical" work; most favourable would be to deny this ROMAN little child of TACITUS – but it just stands there babbling in its penetrating language of the barbarian people of the Germans.

With regards to the *GERMANIA*, things are quite simple, and all problems revolve around *one* either-or. Either the script, which for us today exists under the title *GERMANIA*, is the old, genuine, unscathed work of TACITUS – then we will have to accept it that our ancestors did not possess any culture in TACITUS' times. Because in the *GERMANIA*, TACITUS

"testifies" nothing else but that the Germans had been barbarians in the sense of semi-savage tribes. However, we now have – albeit not from TACITUS or CAESAR – unshakeable counter-proof! This proof *against* the alleged culture-less-ness of the Germans was delivered to us by the science of the spade. As is well-known, ground findings have established that our ancestors as early as 1000 years before TACITUS had permanent village settlements, that they were farmers on a high cultural level who employed the wheel plough in the Bronze Age already, while the Romans were still helping themselves with the Stone Age plough with a hook. "Since the Bronze Age, no cultural break is showing, so the citizens have not changed since those times."<sup>18</sup> Had TACITUS been right with his *GERMANIA* descriptions, our ancestors would not only not have developed any further from an already respectable cultural level, but to the contrary, they would have slowly but steadily degenerated down to the level of semi-savage tribes. However, we let nobody persuade us of such degeneration, least of all a script which calls itself *GERMANIA* and is allegedly the genuine, old, unscathed work of a TACITUS. Because strangely: *as much as the experts consider TACITUS' authorship of the existing GERMANIA a certainty – to this day, nobody has yet proven that the GERMANIA, the way it exists, represents just the genuine, unscathed source of TACITUS.* This is merely a matter of good faith, since the many experts in earlier times had the same belief! But to *prove* TACITUS' authorship of the existing script at all, no, that has not occurred to any expert at all! And yet, it all stands or falls with that proof! So please, one is to prove to us first, that the *today* existing script, calling itself *GERMANIA*, has really been written by TACITUS! Because the fact that the *GERMANIA* has now been sailing for several centuries under the flag of that author's name, by no means proves that this source indeed originates with the ROMAN author TACITUS, that fact once again merely proves the gilded experts' almost unshakeable belief in the authority of the paper tradition. To stress it one more time: it is about the question

whether the *GERMANIA* in *its today version*, the way it has been handed down to us, can or cannot be the genuine work of the ROMAN TACITUS, stemming from the year 98.

In the following, I shall deliver the proof: **the version of the *GERMANIA* facing us today represents a planful falsification of the late medieval forgery workshop.**

**I. Origin of the Germania.** In temporarily accepting the traditional view of TACITUS' authorship, we inquire with the historians what they are able to report on the origin of the work as well as the general disposition, the significance and peculiarities. Why, the *GERMANIA* has been examined exceedingly thoroughly in all nooks and crannies, and one has been able to come to conclusions about the creator by the creation. The experts have probed our "valuable" source with all conceivable sharpness of their relative pseudo-critique. Let us hear their results, in a small, but characteristic selection. "He (TACITUS), despite all the love of truth, did not really busy himself with the finicky research of the last details of factuality. Much rather, he is primarily a sharp-eyed connoisseur of humans and souls... and a skilled stylist."<sup>19</sup> TACITUS is "mainly (!) dependant on his predecessors; he is to be judged as an artist, not as a historical researcher."<sup>20</sup> To such thorough a researcher as NORDEN, "a series of downright surprising connections between TACITUS' information and that of certain GREEK authors of the 5th century BC about entirely different peoples (!) must have been noticed."<sup>21</sup> RASCHFAHL declares TACITUS to be "a superficial and uncritical compiler".<sup>22</sup> With regards to the terms of state law in the *GERMANIA*, FRAHM's result is: "TACITUS exclusively worked with material that flowed from one pen into the next."<sup>23</sup> NORDEN establishes, "that the entire contents of the fourth TACITEAN chapter... down to numerous words... stems from the world of ideas of POSEIDONIOS; namely, the description which the latter gives of the... Northern peoples of the SCYTHIANS and the CELTS... has been transferred to the Germans."<sup>24</sup>

From this small compilation of results already, a surprising discovery follows from the modus operandi of the author of the *GERMANIA*, which is confirmed by every new investigation: *The GERMANIA TACITUS, with regards to form (stylistic) as well as material (expert knowledge), shows a downright slavish dependence on a respectable series of other ROMAN and GREEK authors!* TACITUS really is mainly (!) depending on predecessors. As such predecessors and role models (ROMANS and GREEKS) have been established, among others: HERODOT, STRABO, MELA, POSEIDONIOS, PLINIUS, LIVIUS, CAESAR, SALLUST. Our alleged TACITUS is dependant on SALLUST particularly with regards to formal elements (style, sentence structure, grammar). And this is not perhaps about purely coincidental similarities, no, "for TACITUS, without a doubt, SALLUST's language offered the richest means of description, certain peculiarities in the use of language can only be found with SALLUST and TACITUS."<sup>25</sup> Even his interspersed aphorisms are borrowed from SALLUST. The "skilled stylist" thus shows, in the case of our TACITUS, the cleverness of skilfully pillaging another author.

But the factual contents of the *GERMANIA*, from where did TACITUS draw those? The reader will think: stupid question! If TACITUS endeavours to write about Germany, the composition of the land, about the population and their habits and institutions, he will have simply accurately inquired about those things. Perhaps he undertook a journey to Germany, in order to obtain first-hand information directly in that place? Missed the target, dear reader! All *GERMANIA* researchers tell us: **Tacitus has not been in Germany!** He could not have possibly been in Germany! Else he would not have written down such nonsense, the way it can be simply read in many places of his "masterful piece of art". One researcher thus establishes in all clarity: "Nothing points to knowledge from own experience."<sup>26</sup> Well, in that case, TACITUS will have simply inquired in ROME on the matters to be treated, the reader reckons. Options of inquiry were open to him by questioning ROMAN officers who had been

in Germany, or by asking traders or German prisoners in ROME, or by letters. And now comes the surprise like a thunderbolt: **our good author has not inquired in ROME on the things about which he wanted to write a book, either.** Some researchers still talk about TACITUS having to get his information from trusty respondents in ROME, but this assumption can be flatly refuted, as soon as one only closely looks at the "facts" reported in the *GERMANIA*. Indeed, even the investigations of more recent researchers prove ever more clearly that the man who has written up the *GERMANIA*, could not have inquired about the objects of his work even in ROME with trusty respondents! I remind of the already given judgement by Frahm regarding the terms of state law within the *GERMANIA*: "TACITUS exclusively (!! ) worked with material that flowed from one pen into the next." That means: *TACITUS got all the matter on terms of state law with the Germans from – books, and not from oral edification!!* When our author wanted to write about things on state law in Germany, what did he do? He did *not* get out in the street to ask a trusty respondent for information, but he studied books over books, and what he found in them on his topic written by predecessors, he copied!!

That may well have happened once, the reader thinks, but generally, TACITUS as an educated man with five sound senses, must have inquired orally or by letters about the state of affairs in Germany. After all, it was made so convenient for him to ask an officer or trader for such things; he only had to go out in the streets. Really, TACITUS, as questor, people's tribune, praetor and proconsul of Asia – all of which he was supposed to be – had opportunities in abundance to get in touch with people who could have quenched his thirst for knowledge. But that is just the monstrous thing: **Tacitus has not inquired.** His only source were books and books again. Whatever he reports on Germany and its population – he has gathered his "knowledge" from books, *in doing so however, trimmed his book facts according to his purposes and to his mood.* It is as RASCHFAHL says: Tacitus is a superficial

and uncritical compiler. From his books, he picks out facts, and "places them in the lighting that conforms to his intentions".<sup>27</sup> Indeed, in lighting effects, our *GERMANIA* TACITUS proves to be an unsurpassable "artist". Our artist wants to tell us for example about the *gods* of the Germans. How does he go about it? Does he inquire by going out in the streets, and asking a German prisoner? He does not dream of informing himself in this only sensible manner, but waffles on that the Germans had also honoured MERCURY as a god! And several researchers find this "lighting" of a Germanic god with ROMAN lustre quite brilliant. TACITUS of course only meant to say: the Germans have there some god that "equals" our MERCURY. This "equal" is however missing the point; namely, the real mystery is: why does TACITUS not call this Germanic god by his Germanic name?? (He could have then still made comparisons to his heart's content.) It is quite clear, our author did not inquire for the name of the deity; a little bit, he fantasized away all day. Thus, an expert also arrived at the insight: "TACITUS puts... ROMAN deity names, as the comparison inspired him to, because he did not know the German ones."<sup>28</sup> And why did he not know them?? Because he did not inquire with trusty respondents who could have easily told him!

Whichever matter one might pick out, on close inspection, it always turns out: our *GERMANIA* author has procured his knowledge of things not on the basis of questioning any trusty respondents, but he has gathered his knowledge from books. Thus for example, research has to respond to the question from where the details about the *land distribution* with the Germans stem: TACITUS' information "contains irreconcilable contradictions, and is presumably nothing but a welding together of... Caesar's bit about the SUEVIANS and a not understood detail on the revenue ratios."<sup>29</sup> A brilliant artist is the *GERMANIA* author in handling double- and multiple-entry book-keeping, that is, in skilfully introducing contradictions and ambiguities. *There is, in the entire book, barely a detail which not in a different place in the book has so been modified, complicated and highlighted anew, that a*

*reversion, a restriction of the previously stated, and mostly a contradiction between the details reported in different places are the result.* TACITUS "blurs and veils" his content, FRAHM judges.<sup>30</sup>

Now however, the author has yet the odd detail in his work, of which it could not be established out of which book he has taken it, so that one could counter: he must have yet made inquiries. Against this has to be said, firstly: such details cannot be based on information, either, since TACITUS, as a bright man that he supposedly was, surely was able to accurately re-tell what he was told; but then, where are the countless contradictions coming from? He has simply "uncritically" "muddled up" what he had heard, is the reply. With copying from books, this muddling up would still be somewhat explainable, but when our highly educated ROMAN mixes up higgledy piggledy what he had heard from various sides, then he must have been a luxury specimen of the to us so well-known kind of semi-idiots! Secondly, it has to be said however, if TACITUS has gathered his information from trusty respondents once in a while, how then could he, on *the most important questions* of German state and economic life, of all things, have shunned the oral sources, and, as has been established, have gathered his "facts" from books?? However, the answer to the question from where our author has drawn certain news that he did not draw from books, is this: **from his imagination.**

We summarise the results so far. The man who wrote the *GERMANIA*, has employed a wondrous and most strange procedure: he gathered the knowledge of the things he wanted to write about not by oral questioning, but from books. This finding alone suffices for establishing with certainty that *the version* of the *GERMANIA available to us* cannot possibly have been written in the year 98 by TACITUS in ROME.

II. This certainty once again emerges for us on an entirely new basis of examination, namely the **history of the script tradition** of the *GERMANIA*.

As a first surprise, we find out from research: our "ROMAN" source, *the GERMANIA, during antiquity itself, is mentioned nowhere and by nobody!* That is, the ROMAN authors (of antiquity) strangely enough behave quite in a way as if they had no idea of the existence of a book called *GERMANIA* of the famous TACITUS. Most peculiar! Furthermore, it is established: *through the entire Middle Ages, our GERMANIA is practically completely unknown.* Only ghost-like, minute fractions from the *GERMANIA* once surface with medieval chroniclers (in FULDA). "This little script of the FULDA monks" – referring to the work *ÜBERTRAGUNGEN DES HL. ALEXANDER VON RUDOLF UND MEGINHART* – "...is strange by the fact that, during the entire Middle Ages, the *GERMANIA* of TACITUS is used exclusively in it."<sup>31</sup> (At best, ADAM OF BREMEN is alleged to also have known the *GERMANIA*).<sup>32</sup> I ask: just how could such a first class historical source remain unknown, and even in Germany, be and remain virtually unknown? And if the *GERMANIA* was found and used in FULDA (and BREMEN), just how was it possible to allow this significant script to completely vanish, since else, of course, the least significant "old" scripts were supposedly copied diligently in the monasteries?

Now comes the second surprise, namely on our question when actually the *GERMANIA* emerged again from the ocean of oblivion, for good this time? The reader grows alarmed when hearing the answer: in the year 1455 – i.e. during the time of the great forgery enterprise! – probably in the HERSFELD monastery, an "old" hand-writing was "discovered", which contained, besides the other small works of TACITUS, our *GERMANIA* as well. At any rate, in that year, the "old" script came to ROME (very likely from HERSFELD). *However, this CODEX HERSFELDENSIUS is, very soon after, "unknown" all over again!*<sup>33</sup> Before it vanished again however, one has yet made a copy of the codex. The now still preserved script offspring stems from this humanistic first copy.<sup>34</sup> Chance has unfortunately caused the

"shared model source", the first copy, to vanish as well. We see how the associates of the great enterprise have, with this source as well, worked quite accurately according to their tried and proved "loss" scheme!

Most interesting is the observation that the humanistic *copyists* of the preserved scripts, tracing back to the CODEX HERSELDENSIS or the lost shared model source respectively, have been the same ninnies as their alleged colleagues from the most varying centuries of the Middle Ages. Especially when it came to copying *names* ( datings do of course not appear in the *GERMANIA*, so that the "copyists" were at least freed from the most ungrateful of all tasks: to fabricate in chronology). Why, that's just the way it is, copyists were rarely able to correctly read and copy names. We know of course, why they weren't allowed to be able! In the CODEX HERSELDENSIS, too, the tooth of time must have gnawed away at the names especially! The pseudo-TACITUS has given the name of the primeval god-father of the Germans; it stood in the CODEX HERSELDENSIS. But the name is probably written in hieroglyphs, because the *preserved* scripts present as the name of the primeval father the following forms to choose: TRISTONEM – TIRSTONEM – TVISTONEM – TISTONEM – TUISCONEM. To that, the experts remark: the flighty copyists have erred. However, this is not an error so many times over, but there was deliberation at work, to not determine one certain unique name of the primeval god-father, because especially the area of mythology – one is to remember MERCURY – was *meant to* be covered by impenetrable darkness.

Our investigation has, by two different ways (1. Origin, 2. Script tradition), delivered the same result: the way the *GERMANIA* exists today, it can not possibly have been written in the year 98 in ROME; in its nowadays version, it represents a forgery, namely, the described origin (compiling from books) accurately pinpoints the *learned* forgery action.

## 4.

### The ROMAN fairy tale of the barbarianism of the Germans

Today, the research on the Germans, inasmuch as it is based on ROMAN sources, does not stand *before*, but finds itself *in* the middle of a crisis. The associated uncomfortable feeling already pains some experts, but so far, they have not yet discovered the true cause and thus a means of eliminating the crisis situation. Some researchers already have it on the tip of their tongues: in the libraries, place TACITUS and CAESAR, with their reports on the Germans, where it is the darkest. CAESAR, too? Yes, because now we will deliver proof that the descriptions of the CELTS and Germans of this celebrated ROMAN author, *the way they are available for us today* in his *COMMENTARIES* (diaries) on the GAELIC war, have been systematically, and from the ground up, re-worked by the late medieval forgery association according to the pursued tendency as well.

I. **The falsification of CAESAR's ethnographic excursus'.** Our course of evidence takes the same path that we took in examining the TACITEAN *GERMANIA*. Again, we will be concerned with the *origin* of CAESAR's reports. So, we ask: whence does Caesar draw his written down "facts"? In this, the reader will always be aware that this author had spent time by the RHEIN! So, to a much greater extent than with TACITUS, we expect that CAESAR's descriptions of the German (and CELTIC) state of affairs are based upon inquiries, for which he had of course convenient and abundant opportunities. However, what research has to report to us, sounds so alienating, that at first, we do not quite trust our ears. The result of the investigations, whence CAESAR has his knowledge of ethnographical things, short and sweet, is this: he has drawn them – exactly like TACITUS – from *books!!*

I reference several results of research. "Now, NORDEN [*DIE GERMANISCHE URGESCHICHTE; THE GERMANIC PRIMEVAL HISTORY*; insert by Kammeier]... himself

establishes that the sentence "deorum maxime Mercurium colunt" is word for word the same with HERODOT, CAESAR and TACITUS (applied to three different peoples!), that "CAESAR's news on the druids conform with those of STRABO, DIODOR in a manner, which, at the same time, makes... the assumption of a direct connection necessary", so that "the only assumption left is that they all have drawn their knowledge from a joint source..."<sup>35</sup> CAESAR's modus operandi, taking his information from books, which we just got to know with regards to the CELTIC reports, also reveals itself with the described German state of affairs, for example with the German "hundred"<sup>III</sup>. It is "an amazing and alarming sign for ROMAN reporting", says FRAHM, "that it talks of the German hundred only in dark hints".<sup>36</sup> H PHILIPP makes it probable "that the passages about the quite unclear and erroneous geography of the upper RHEIN and of the HELVETIANS have been borrowed by CAESAR from ARTEMIDOR or another ethnographical source."<sup>37</sup> NORDEN states that "CAESAR has taken on his overview over the three CELTIC peoples' groups from POSEIDONIOS." "Insights on state law are not to be gained from CAESAR's terminology for CELTIC and Germanic tribes or peoples, it can only create confusion."<sup>38</sup> FRAHM then summarises his judgement to the effect that "a part of the material offered by CAESAR stems from the same stream of tradition as that of TACITUS", and once, he even reckons: "... as soon as we are prepared to trace CAESAR's excursus' on the CELTS and Germans completely (!) or partly back to the ethnographical literature".<sup>39</sup>

*So, CAESAR, too, nicks his knowledge of things and institutions of the (CELTS and) Germans out of books!* If research cannot yet decide to admit that all of CAESAR's information is based upon book studies, it is because it appears monstrous to the expert critics that CAESAR, in full deliberation, preferred obsolete, dead book sources to the living sources available to him. CAESAR then was probably yet "the man... to proactively interfere with ethnographical research", NORDEN shouts out in a huff. Certainly! But the way the excursus'

---

III      'hundred' here means the equivalent of the classical administrative division of a county

simply exist today, it turns out that the author who has written them down in their present version, stands downright helplessly before his things, and anxiously sticks with books. And if one admits that, CAESAR surely has yet procured information about this or that state law or economical things, which should have been an easy thing for him, one has to unfortunately establish that he then "would have uncritically accepted all sorts", or that he, the great spirit, was then unable to confirm what he had learned by checking, and on the other hand, to clearly and uniquely write it down. As a matter of fact, his information is as confused and ambiguous as that of TACITUS! His news on the religion of the Germans are completely wrong! He could have effortlessly found out the right information, had he been inquiring. That much is certain: had CAESAR written the excursus', *he would, without a doubt, have based his description on oral information*. The author of the today existing reports has *not* done this, he has taken, like pseudo-TACITUS, his knowledge from books, but that means: CAESAR has *not* written the ethnographical excursus' in their present form! The reports must be forged.

**II. The relation between the forged reports of CAESAR and TACITUS.** CAESAR's and TACITUS' reports about Germany – in the form available to us today – have been cooked up in the ROMAN forgery headquarters, quite according to the meaning and the recipe of the tendency. This general tendency of the universal action, effective in all parts of the newly created tradition, will be discussed momentarily. For now, we want to have a look at the relation of the descriptions of the reports of the one pseudo-ROMAN to the other. By the investigations of the previous Books, the reader has already been put in a position to clairvoyantly reveal the facts of the matter that we are dealing with. How did the forgers proceed in fabricating their reports on Germany? They once again employed the so handy "double-entry book-keeping". The forgers very soon realised how dangerous it was if they had only *one* pseudo-ROMAN making statements on German things. This one might twist and

turn and wriggle as much as he wants, in the end, he yet had to come to certain details about the Germans, regardless of how skilfully he was encoding them. Why, there was so much to be *invented* about the "barbarian" Germans, the entire "barbarian" background of the picture had to be painted with the paints of phantasy. Uniqueness was not at all wanted there! Thus, it resolved itself: at least two "ROMANS" had to report on Germany! The Germany prose was foisted on *two* ROMANS, so that in the forgery headquarters, one had the opportunity to say much about the Germans, and yet nothing unique, in short: to employ double-entry book-keeping. These tactics have then been thoroughly followed, too.

Only one example of many: According to TACITUS' scheme 'sacerdos ac rex vel princeps', in the 'civitas', "a priest and a statesman stood at the helm next to each other – such a 'princeps civitatis' stands... in irreconcilable opposition to CAESAR's statement that the Germanic tribes, in peace times, did not have a 'communis magistratus', equally does TACITUS' statement, that the 'dux' had no penal authority, stand in the most stark opposition to CAESAR's claim that he [the 'dux'] had the right to "power over life and death"."<sup>40</sup> So, as much as the forgery association has else always fabricated every narrating source (and so many documents) in at least two versions, it has equally placed the complex of the Germans in two vessels by having two authors comment on the "subject". These, and all the many other contradictions between our two pseudo-ROMANS, over which the experts so fruitlessly rack their brains, have been placed in the forged sources with full deliberation, because clear and unique information was meant to be and had to be avoided.

Thus now, the big mystery is solved for us, how a CAESAR and a TACITUS, when setting out to write about Germany, did not draw their knowledge from oral sources, not from life, but, strangely, from their book shelves. Why, there was no other choice at all left for the late medieval forgers in ROME, than to seek refuge with books in their concept of the German barbarian novel! Here, I remark: much in these pseudo-ROMAN sources is plain phantasy (i.e.

all the attributes by which the barbarianism had to be demonstrated), however, in the newly painted picture, numerous genuine, real parts of Germanic nature and life have been preserved.

**III. The tendency of the forged ROMAN sources, as well as the general tendency of the forgery action per se.** The guiding tendency in the fabrication of the "ROMAN" reports on Germans comes across out of the forged sources with perceptible clarity. The tendency preaches to us noisily: the Germans are a people without culture, with the most primitive civilisation; life of the Germans takes place in ways that characterise a people that only just passed the lowest threshold of human development. One can open the *GERMANIA* in any place, everywhere we get to hear that our ancestors were supposedly a semi-savage crop of humans, may it be about clothing, nutrition, occupation or whatever else. However, in consequent pursuit of the used veiling tactics, almost all starkly barbarian traits have now been painted over with a light sheen of ameliorating cover paint. Thus, according to pseudo-TACITUS, the clothing of the Germans consists only of a coat or a thrown over fur, yes, in battle, they even dropped the coat! – but the "rich" excel with an undergarment. On the one hand, our ancestors eat wild grown fruit (crab-apples) – yet, they also grow some grain. Conspicuously, TACITUS does not at all mention bread as food! The Germans reject anything resembling permanent settlements – but the man chases his adulterous wife "through the entire village". One can now of course interpret so skilfully, that only the ameliorating side comes out, only in that case, one must not forget to mention that there is quite something else to read in the *GERMANIA*. "The vagueness of the sources that is indeed suited to facilitate a different, yes, the opposite interpretation" can just simply not be denied away. Thus, the tendency of our "ROMAN" sources proclaims, despite all amelioration, that the Germans are cultureless barbarians.

Now, the forgers have succeeded exceedingly skilfully in interspersing this world of culture-less-ness with oasis', in which genuine, real German life continued blossoming, such as the upholding of the sanctity of marriage, loyalty and hospitality. One amazedly asks why the forgers did not also eliminate these shining traits from their picture? That was necessary for the following reason: crucial for the concept was the proclamation of culture-less-ness. Everything that somewhat agreed with the barbarianism, that did not directly suspend the striking attributes of the barbarianism, was suited well enough for incorporating in the descriptions. The barbarian, too, can uphold hospitality! However, how much pain the forgers' association took to yet not at all let the general tendency of the barbarianism become ineffective, is testified by the phenomenon, that even these shining attributes have again been disfigured almost unnoticeably. The Germans upheld the sanctity of marriage – but polygamy was rife amongst them! The Germans much valued cleanliness; after getting up, they washed or bathed – but they let their children grow up in the dirt, naked and neglected!! Thus, the contradictions and ambiguities chase each other. With regards to double-entry book-keeping, the *GERMANIA* is a masterpiece of the ROMAN forgery headquarters.

The tendency of the forged reports on the Germans thus aims at creating "historical proof" for the "fact" that at the time, when the ROMAN people had reached a high level of culture, the Germanic peoples were still vegetating in a state of semi-savage barbarianism.

The other big tendency of the universal action as well is already "historically" rooted in the *GERMANIA*: *the church is the highest judge, the priest stands above the secular prince*. It has to stick out which peculiar station is allocated to the German *priest* next to the army leader and the *princeps*. What the curia had in mind for an ideal, was fictionalised into the *GERMANIA* as old historical reality. Consistently, the priest ('*sacerdos*') appears to be superior to the secular leader. In a court of law for example, the priest exerts a crucial influence on the course of proceedings. Namely, in the 11th chapter of the *GERMANIA*, it says: it is the priest's

job to order silence in the court. Also, the penal authority lay not with the secular 'dux', but the priest. Thus, the *GERMANIA* has its clerical fabrication and provenance written on its forehead.

*So, the general tendencies of the history falsification action are: 1. All civilisation came to the Germans from the ROMANS; from the old ROME, the sun ascends over Germany; 2. The culture was bestowed upon the barbaric Germans by Christianity, and every secular power is a subject to the papal chair.*

## 5.

### **The invention of HENRY IV's march of penance to CANOSSA**

It is plainly obvious: for the ROMAN curia, the *main purpose* of the big forgery action was, besides all other also effective tendencies and objectives, to "historically" point out and make evident the justification and gradual implementation of the papal claims for the highest rule of the world via the to be newly created history of the Middle Ages. And therefore, it had to be demonstrated with at least *one* big and shining, to humanity forever overwhelmingly memorable, "historical" event and example, how the ROMAN pope, as Christ's representative, had the power to throw a German King in the dust, in order to then graciously lift him up again from deepest self-humiliation. Since historically, such event has never taken place, the forgery association simply had to invent such "fact". This history fictionalisation is titled CANOSSA.

In order to establish the fact of the invention of the CANOSSA march of penance, we again refer to the sources that report on CANOSSA. With regards to the clarification of the CANOSSA complex, research has already done thorough initial work, whereas it is of course not surprising that it was not possible at all for the experts from their standpoint, to lift the veil of these things, and to recognise the whole CANOSSA story as fiction. Research has found out that *two main sources* are essential for the CANOSSA events: 1. An allegedly soon after the event written down *report of pope GREGORY VII. to all archbishops, bishops, dukes, counts of the Empire of the Germans*; 2. *the annals of a monk LAMBERT (LAMPERT) in HERSFELD*.

**I. The annals of LAMBERT OF HERSFELD.** The alleged author has supposedly joined the HERSFELD monastery in 1058, and has written his annals between 1077 and 1080.<sup>41</sup> Previously, he authored two more works, with which we have to briefly concern ourselves in order to realise whose mental child our LAMBERT is. First, he wrote a biography (*VITA S. LULLI*). "This work demonstrates that, for the author, it was not about composing a historically true picture of the life of the successor of the h. BONIFATIUS", MANITIUS judges. How did Lambert proceed? "He changes the existing facts at free will, and calmly invents some more."<sup>42</sup> Oh, really?! Our author "calmly invents some more"! Next flowed out of his quill a story of his monastery in form of an epos, to which his abbot inspired him. How did this opus come out? "He had no luck with it, because one (i.e. his monastery brothers) accused him of having written much opposed to the truth in his verses." LAMBERT sits down again, and this time, he writes the story in prose, but now, as a cautious man, he comments "that he could only lament, not narrate, what had happened in more recent (!) times... One is to consider that he did not want to write about everything that had happened in the state and in the church, because he was locked up in the monastery like in a prison, had no more human contact, and did not care much for such things." Oh, really?! He does not care much for things that are happening in the outside world, he rather "invents" a bit!

We are already somewhat prepared, what LAMBERT's **annals** might look like with regards to the essence of truth. The author treats things of *his* time, i.e. the reigning period of HENRY IV. It is predominantly striking that LAMBERT's entire work is virtually sparking hatred against HENRY IV.; all of his compassion goes out to pope GREGORY VII. Now, at what results did research arrive regarding the events reported by LAMBERT? H DELBRÜCK "has clearly proven in numerous places, that LAMBERT, out of hatred against the King, has not only avoided the truth, but has simply falsified it." (MANITIUS, p 326) "R KUBO points out that LAMBERT's reports on conspiracies and Princes' gatherings have been worked according the same pattern, i.e. they lack interior truth." "And HOLDER-EGGER points out the contradiction, that our monk pretends to be in the know about the most secret arrangements of all parties, whereas, in a different place, he says that he could not learn much inside his monastery walls." We owe to HOLDER-EGGER the most thorough treatment of LAMBERT; I recommend his works (in the NEW ARCHIVE OF THE SOCIETY FOR OLDER GERMAN HISTORICAL SCIENCE, Vol. 19)<sup>IV</sup> to the readers, whenever they find the time. HOLDER-EGGER talks of "wild nonsense", of the "most coarse improbabilities", of the "fairy tales" and "lumps of phrases" that stand in LAMBERT's annals. "The entirety of so numerous speeches in LAMBERT are school exercises, imitating his role models SALLUST and LIVIUS." (NA vol. 19, p 532)

Now, regarding especially the *CANOSSA events* and the preceding events, HOLDER-EGGER arrives at a devastating result for any veracity in LAMBERT's description, which is summarised by ZEUMER<sup>43</sup> as follows: "LAMBERT is untrue through and through, his description is quite disfigured by bias... One is not to believe a word of the found out liar. But the famous description now, how HENRY IV., after his ban and the Princes' breaking with him, undertakes his march of penance; how he, abandoned by everybody, accompanied by his

---

IV In the endnotes called 'NA'

wife and one loyal knight, sets out on the strenuous journey across the winterly alpine pass, and how he finally, in the forecourt of CANOSSA castle..., had to stand in snow and ice for three days in the penance dress before he succeeded in effecting the lifting of the ban by the pope, rests *on him* [LAMBERT] *alone*. These for the Emperordom so humiliating events fizzled out into nothingness before HOLDER-EGGER's critical, sharp sense, since he proves everything to be a fabric of lies by the HERSEFELD monk." "Coming to the bottom line..., it turns out that the story of the King, three days standing penance in ice and snow..., is a fable... It is to be struck from the history books." (HOLDER-EGGER, NA vol. 19, p 553) With this now, HOLDER-EGGER has not perhaps proven the entire CANOSSA story to be a fable – much rather, to him, the bare "fact" that HENRY, in CANOSSA, was begging of GREGORY VII. to lift the ban, stands as firm as it did before! – he only dismisses LAMBERT's humiliating decorations (such as the lonely crossing the ALPS and the three days standing penance) as a biased fairy tale of the HERSEFELD monk.

**II. The report of Gregory VII. to the German bishops and Princes.** Authority-devout, the history writers have for centuries taken LAMBERT's fables of the CANOSSA events for historical truth, until RANKE, for the first time, has critically examined the annals and aired doubts. Today, LAMBERT as a fairy tale narrator is finally finished. Today, "unanimous agreement has been reached that a story of the events in CANOSSA, valid in terms of critique can only be based upon the facts reported by GREGORY VII. himself", but no longer upon LAMBERT.<sup>44</sup> So, we now stand before the *main source* for the CANOSSA "fact", and this main source, according to the unanimous judgement of the experts, is supposedly so clean and historically authentic, that any doubt must grow silent.

*Now, where is GREGORY's report about Canossa to be found?* This report, i.e., the only one which, according to the experts' opinion, deserves credit, stands **in the registry of GREGORY VII.!!** What? In the GREGORY registry?? The reader grows suspicious – very

suspicious. They remember having already read quite a bit about the GREGORY registry, in chapter 3 of Book 3 of this volume. There, it had been proven *that GREGORY VII.'s registry, front to end, is a forgery of the ROMAN headquarters!* And thus, it is established, **GREGORY's report about CANOSSA is also a straight invention! With this, the main source for CANOSSA breaks down, and thus, finally, the entire CANOSSA story is recognised for what it really is, namely fiction.**

**III. The concept of the CANOSSA fiction.** When the forgers set out to sketch the plan for the CANOSSA novel, they found themselves facing a difficult, even unsolvable task. For it is impossible to so fictionalise the story of a German King, abandoned by all the world, throwing himself in the dust before the pope, that the events sound factual and psychologically *believable*. No writer can do that, not a SHAKESPEARE, either, who already had to, *a priori*, base his LEAR on impossible premises. The CANOSSA novel has thus of course turned out to be an exceedingly pitiful fabrication. Starting point and climax of the concept was meant to be the big penance scene. In order to make this scene appear possible, HENRY IV. had to first be portrayed as abandoned by everybody; for this circumstance to happen, the King, in turn, had to previously break up with all the world. Of course, "history" now reports to us how HENRY "indeed" made one enemy after another. But how did HENRY go about it? Again, we have to have a look at the sources. Which one is the "authoritative" source? It is our famous LAMBERT! From him, everybody knows how HENRY IV. pestered and pained the SAXONS. What inspired HENRY to such course of action? Naturally, LAMBERT is able to answer this very accurately and in detail: he presents it so, as if "the root cause of everything bad in the Empire, the first reason for the uprising of the SAXONS and THURINGIANS" had been "the *Thuringian fight over the tenth*". (NA vol. 19, p 382) However, research now has established that this is a "poisonous, malevolent disfiguration" by LAMBERT. According to other sources (which are of course also forged), it is a fact "that it is

nothing but a phantasy product of LAMBERT, if he makes a close causal connection between the SAXON uprising and the question of the THURINGIAN fight over the tenth". But how could LAMBERT have waffled up such a thing? Well, by this way of motivation, he achieved that *two* tribes at once could be presented as HENRY's enemies. HENRY, according to the plan of the novel, has to make enemies, no matter how dumb he goes about it. For example, he wants to and must pain the SAXONS to their blood. Why actually?? Allegedly, because he could simply not stomach this tribe!! So, as the history books so beautifully call it, he offends "the SAXON Princes by arrogant pride". He ordered castles to be established "on all mountains and hills", and allowed the troops stationed there not only to rob und pillage, but also to abuse and rape the SAXON women and daughters. He virtually thinks up infamies. We do not need to waste any more time on such fairy tales – because that is what these reports are. Research itself has already arrived at the insight: "There is hardly ever full certainty to be gained about these things... the way our sources appear."<sup>45</sup> Namely, in the (forged) sources, one encounters "a true witches' bubbling of the most varying, contradicting (!) opinions." However, the researchers did not notice the main tactics of the forgers. For our story teller LAMBERT has cheekily attributed to HENRY IV., what HENRY I. had once initiated: namely the erection of fortified places and castles! *HENRY IV.'s castles are a poetic new edition of HENRY I.'s castles.* LAMBERT's tricky fight over the tenth also has its role model in HENRY I.'s tribute to the HUNGARIANS, which he refused, so that the HUNGARIANS then assaulted THURINGIA and SAXONY. The SAXON *hordes of riders* in the wondrous fairy tale battle at the UNSTRUT (!) are not missing, either!

Thus, the beginning of the CANOSSA novel was tinkered together most laboriously and in ridiculously coarse fashion, and multiple-entry book-keeping (contradictions!) was exceedingly utilised in the various sources. But one thing was accomplished: HENRY IV. was

portrayed as a universally hated tyrant who develops a downright genius in making all the world his enemy.

*Second stage of the novel.* Poetic objective: HENRY IV. has to be abandoned by everybody, but really, well and truly by everybody!! Because else, he cannot, after his ban, as a lonely pilgrim, set out across the ALPS on his "march of penance", accompanied only by his wife plus a loyal one. Thus now, after GREGORY VII.'s anathema, all German Princes promptly break with the King. Equally promptly, embittered enemies such as the SAXONS and SWABIANS make up; the knights of both armies "exchange the kiss of peace under tears". Everybody harmoniously joins against HENRY. In TRIBUR, the Princes hold a meeting, but they now do not depose the evil tyrant King, instead they graciously advise him to go on a pilgrimage across the ALPS in a hurry, and to humiliate himself before the pope. If he only does this, they then want to forget everything evil that happened, and quite happily further acknowledge HENRY as King! But he must go on a pilgrimage across the ALPS! He cannot perhaps do his penance in Germany – where would be the climax of the fiction?! Where would CANOSSA be?! – no, he has to, by all means, prostrate himself before the pope beyond the ALPS' mountain range.

Now, it does not surprise us at all in the slightest to hear that particularly over this fictionalised Princes' meeting (and over the events in the nearby OPPENHEIM, where HENRY was supposedly staying back then), there is hovering again such fog of impossibilities and contradictions, so that research has to admit: nobody can make head or tail of it! MEYER v. KNONAU<sup>46</sup> confesses: "In the face of such insufficient, fragmentary, contradicting news, it is difficult, nay, in some things impossible, to establish what really happened in TRIBUR and OPPENHEIM." The main source is of course again the "well-informed" LAMBERT! Other sources cautiously name no meeting place at all (!), or a different one! One of the most difficult questions over which the researchers rack their brains, is this: what caused the

Princes to suddenly refrain from the most drastic action? Namely, to swiftly depose HENRY IV.? It is clear to us why the Princes could not do that – because then, the forgers would deprive themselves of the climax of the novel. HENRY had to, by all means, go across the ALPS! Now, until TRIBUR, HENRY still had friends, even an army. However, the fiction demands that the King sets out on his penance journey *alone*. Our novel-HENRY realises this, too, and what does he do? He dismisses all still remaining loyals; numerously swarming new supporters, he turns away contritely. He even dismisses his army! Besides that, he does nothing but begging and supplicating! Finally now, the forgers have gotten their fiction King, a German LEAR, so far that he can set out on his fable journey across the high ALPS mountain range as a lonely pilgrim.

A less credible novel than the CANOSSA fiction has rarely been papped together by a writer. With the insight of the true nature of the forged CANOSSA story, finally and for good, the greatest humiliation in the German history of the Kings is erased.

In order to not bust the initial plan of these Books, the odd contribution to the topic of the universal forgery enterprise had to be temporarily put on hold. In later publications, the enterprise will be discussed from new vantage points, especially under archaeological aspects.

## **Endnotes**

Abbreviations:

MIÖG = Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichte [Messages of the Institute for Austrian History]

NA = Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde [New Archive of the Society for older German Historical Science]

- 1 See Mach – Erkenntnis und Irrtum (Insight and error), p 174  
2 Westdeutsche Zeitschrift (West German Magazine), vol. 32, p 366  
3 H Wibel in NA vol. XXIX, p 656  
4 H Breßlau – Urkundenlehre I, p 11  
5 Historische Zeitschrift (Historical Magazine), vol. 120, p 3 ff.  
6 R Schröder – Lehrbuch der deutschen Rechtsgeschichte (Studybook of German Legal History), 1898, p 252  
7 R Schröder, l.c., p 230  
8 R Schröder, l.c., p 230  
9 R Schröder, l.c., p 252  
10 R Schröder, l.c., p 232  
11 NA vol. 46, p 313  
12 Brunner – Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte I (German Legal History I), 1887, p 383  
13 NA vol. 37, p 344  
14 R Schröder, l.c., p 636  
15 F Frensdorff – Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Rechtsbücher, Göttingische Nachrichten (Contributions to the History of the German Legal History, Göttingen News), 1921, p 156  
16 Frensdorff – Göttingische Gelehrte Nachrichten (Göttingen Learned News), 1921, p 136, 137  
17 Frensdorff, l.c., p 140  
18 H Philipp – Tacitus Germania, p 71  
19 W S Teuffel – Geschichte der Römischen Literatur (History of the Roman Literature), 6th edit., vol. 3, p 11  
20 W S Teuffel, l.c., p 16  
21 W Capelle – Das alte Germanien (The old Germany), p 417 / K Müllerhoff – Deutsche Altertumskunde 4(German Antiquity Science 4), p 517  
22 Historische Vierteljahrsschrift (Historical Quarterly) 24, p 145  
23 Historische Vierteljahrsschrift (Historical Quarterly) 24, p 181  
24 E Norden – Die germanische Urgeschichte in Tacitus' Germania (The German primeval History in Tacitus' Germania), p 115  
25 Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte (Research on German History), vol. 4, p 189  
26 Teuffel - Geschichte der römischen Literatur, vol. 3 , p 24  
27 Teuffels Geschichte, vol. 3, p 16  
28 Tacitus Historien und Annalen, nach der Übersetzung von (after the translation of) K Fr Bahrdt, vol. II, p 327, footnote 17  
29 Historische Vierteljahrsschrift (Historical Quarterly) 24, p 146  
30 Historische Vierteljahrsschrift (Historical Quarterly) 24, p 150  
31 Historische Zeitschrift 64, p 158  
32 Archiv für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde 4(Archive for older German historical science 4), p 472  
33 Teuffel - Geschichte der römischen Literatur, vol. 3 , p 21  
34 E Norden – Die germanische Urgeschichte in Tacitus' Germania, p 193/194  
35 Historische Vierteljahrsschrift 24, p 151  
36 Frahm, l.c., p 156  
37 Historische Vierteljahrsschrift 24, p 152  
38 Historische Vierteljahrsschrift 24, p 155  
39 Historische Vierteljahrsschrift 24, p 153, 157  
40 Historische Vierteljahrsschrift 24, p 172  
41 M Manitius – Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters (History of the Latin literature in the Middle Ages), vol. 3, p 323 f  
42 Manitius, l.c., p 324  
43 NA vol. 37, p 855  
44 Meyer v Knonau – Jahrbücher des deutschen Reiches unter Heinrich IV. und Heinrich V. (Yearbooks of the German Empire under Henry IV. and Henry V.), vol. 2, p 900  
45 Meyer v Knonau, l.c., p 865, footnote 26  
46 Meyer v Knonau, l.c., p 890